

REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action mailed March 2, 2007, claims 1-5 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kortum et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0079028). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

A. Claims 1-5

Independent claim 1 as amended recites “a connection status checking unit for checking the connection status of a linked server specified by each piece of the link information included within the menu screen, the connection status indicating whether the linked server is wirelessly accessible or not from a present location of the terminal.” Kortum et al. is directed toward providing “an interface that allows a subscriber to access, maintain, and troubleshoot services over a single DSL line through a unified interface.” Page 2, Para. 0031. “DSL provides a dedicated line that is instantly available to its subscribers.” Page 2, Para. 0041. Therefore, Kortum et al. is directed toward conventional internet access over a single DSL, not wireless communication. *See, e.g.,* Abstract; Field of the Invention.

Kortum et al. lists Internet services available to the subscriber. Page 3, Para. 0049. “The list of services is specific to what is actually available to a particular subscriber.” *Id.* “Further, the subscriber may add or delete Internet services as necessary.” *Id.* The list of services may include “services offered” by service providers. *Id.* Therefore, presumably, whether a service is “available” in the context of Kortum et al. means that the user has already subscribed to the service such that the service may then be “selected at the subscriber’s discretion” once connected to a network. Page 3, Para. 0042. Therefore, the cited portions of Kortum et al. do not disclose determining whether a server is wirelessly accessible or not.

Claim 1 also recites “a menu screen display processing unit for displaying the connection status of the linked server checked by the connection status checking unit on the menu screen.” The cited portions of Kortum et al. also do not disclose displaying an indication of whether a server is wirelessly accessible or not. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 1 has been overcome.

Claims 2-5 depend upon independent claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Additionally, claim 3 as amended recites “wherein a discrimination mark differs depending upon a level of the connection status and is associated with the corresponding piece of the link information, the level of the connection status indicating the strength of radio waves received by the terminal associated with the linked server.” The cited portions of Kortum et al. do not measure and then indicate the strength of radio waves.

Claim 5 recites “the menu screen display processing unit does not display a piece of the link information corresponding to an inaccessible server.” The cited portions of Kortum et al. do not disclose determining whether a server is inaccessible. Therefore, the cited portions of Kortum et al. cannot disclose removing link information associated with an inaccessible server from a list of link information displayed.

B. Claims 18-20

Independent claim 18 as amended recites “checking the connection status of a linked server specified by each piece of the link information included within the menu screen, the connection status indicating whether radio waves associated with the linked server are wirelessly accessible or not.” As indicated above, the cited portions of Kortum et al. do not indicate whether a linked server is wirelessly accessible or monitor corresponding radio waves carrying information from the linked server. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 18 has been overcome. Claims 19 and 20 depend upon claim 18 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kortum et al. in view of Nakano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,430,499).

A. Claim 6

Claim 6 depends upon independent claim 1. The cited portions of Nakano et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Kortum et al. indicated above with respect to claim 1. For instance, the cited portions of Nakano et al. merely disclose conventional speed sensors and GPS receivers, not “a connection status checking unit for checking the connection status of a linked server specified by each piece of the link information included within the menu screen, the connection status indicating whether the linked server is wirelessly accessible or not from a present location of the terminal,” as recited by amended claim 1.

B. Claims 7-17

Independent claim 7 as amended recites “a connection status checking unit for checking the connection status of a linked server specified by each piece of the link information included within the menu screen when the connection status changes, the connection status indicating whether the linked server is wirelessly accessible or not.” As indicated above with respect to claims 1 and 6, the cited portions of Kortum et al. and Nakano et al. do not disclose checking and then displaying the wireless accessibility of linked servers. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 7 has been overcome.

Claims 8-17 depend upon independent claim 7 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Additionally, claim 8 recites “wherein the connection status of the linked server changes when the speed of the vehicle changes and crosses a predetermined value.” Column 17, lines 65-67 of Nakano et al. relied upon by the Office Action discusses a conventional speed sensor and merely states “[t]he speed sensor is used for detecting the

moving speed of the information terminal 1 and calculating the distance traveled based on the detection result.” Therefore, the portions of Nakano et al. cited do not disclose changing the connection status of a linked server when the speed of a vehicle crosses a reference value.

Claim 9 recites “the connection status of the linked server changes when the electric field strength of received radio waves in the communication processing unit changes and crosses a predetermined reference value.” The cited portions of Nakano et al. disclose a GPS receiver operable to receive GPS signals, not changing the connection status of a linked server when the strength of received radio waves crosses a reference value.

Claim 11 recites “the connection status of the linked server changes when the geographic conditions determined by the geographic condition determining unit change.” Column 17, line 63 of Nakano et al. merely discloses a conventional GPS receiver, not changing the connection status of the linked server when it is determined that geographic conditions have changed.

Claim 12 recites “the connection status of the linked server changes when the type of road determined by the road determining unit changes.” Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner was referring to column 1, lines 50-60 of Nakano et al., not column 29. However, the road network data of Nakano et al. does not relate to changing the connection status of a linked server when the type of road changes.

Claim 13 recites “the connection status of the linked server changes when the past communication status corresponding to the driving location of the vehicle is determined to be unfavorable based upon the communication status history stored within the communication status history storing unit.” Col. 1, ll. 16-28 of Nakano et al. does not disclose a communication status history.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the Application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Timothy J. Le Duc". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Timothy J. Le Duc
Registration No. 54,745
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: May 15, 2007